

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain pending in the subject application. Claims 18-56 are newly submitted for consideration. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application in view of the following remarks.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended portions of the specification to correct typographical errors. It is submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants submit that no new matter has been added since claims 12 and 15 have been amended to correct clerical errors, and claim 17 now recites the same limitations as the originally filed claim 1.

Objections to the Drawings

Applicants acknowledge the notice of informal drawings. Applicants propose to submit formal drawings upon notice of allowance of the patent application.

Claims 1-17

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-14, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Flaherty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,824 B1, hereinafter "O'Flaherty"). Claims 10, 12, 15, and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that O'Flaherty fails to teach, disclose, or even suggest "said virtual table having a different column signature than said record" as recited in claim 1. The passage of O'Flaherty cited in the Office Action (col. 10, l. 66 to col. 11, l. 2) merely describes a "technique [that] reduces the processing [time] required to present the data to the data

requestor.” (Col. 11, ll. 4-5). It does not describe the dataviews as having different column signatures than the base tables. In fact, Figure 11 of O’Flaherty shows that dataviews have the same column signature as the base tables. Different dataviews simply mask the data in different rows and columns from view. Thus, O’Flaherty cannot be relied upon to teach the claimed limitation.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that O’Flaherty fails to disclose each and every limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over O’Flaherty. Since independent claim 17 recites the same limitation discussed above in reference to claim 1, claim 17 is likewise allowable. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-16 are also allowable as they are dependent upon allowable independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 18-24

Since claims 18-24 depend from allowable independent claim 17, they should likewise be allowable.

Claims 25-32

Claims 25-32 are system claims that correspond to some of the allowable process claims 1-16, and therefore should also be allowable for some or all of the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 33-56

Claims 33, 41, and 49 all recite the limitation “said virtual table is not defined with database metadata.” Applicants respectfully submit that O’Flaherty fails to teach, disclose, or even suggest this limitation, and in fact, teaches the exact opposite. O’Flaherty states that the “database management system . . . define[s] a virtual table and save[s] that definition in the database as metadata” and the “[m]etadata about the privacy dataviews . . . is stored persistently in the databases metadata.” (Col. 4, ll. 7-11 and ll. 18-23). Therefore, O’Flaherty cannot be relied upon to teach the claimed limitation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 33, 41, and 49 are allowable. Since claims 34-40 depend from claim 33, claims 42-48 depend from claim 41, and claims 50-56 depend from claim 49, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

LYON & LYON LLP

Dated: 6-10-02

By:


Erin C. Ming
Reg. No. 47,797

633 West Fifth Street, Suite 4700
Los Angeles, California 90071-2066
(408) 993-1555



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES

In the Specification

Page 4, first paragraph (lines 2-6) has been amended as follows:

The present invention is directed to a method and mechanism for encoding multiple virtual tables into one or more source tables. An aspect of the invention is directed to the access of a virtual table [virtual table] without requiring separate entries for the virtual table in the meta-data of a database system. Another aspect of the invention is directed to a virtual table that has different column signatures than its underlying source table(s).

In the Claims

Claim 12, 15, and 17 have been amended as follows:

12. (Amended) The process of claim 1 in which said record comprises a first and a second column, both said first and said second columns are used to populate a single column in said virtual table.

15. (Amended) The process of claim 13 further comprising:
identifying a second data source;
associating a second record within said second data source to a second virtual table;
accessing said second record; and
logically populating said second virtual table with said second record, wherein said data manipulation operation operates against both said virtual table and said second virtual table.

17. (Amended) A computer program product that includes a medium usable by a processor, the medium having stored thereon a sequence of instructions which, when executed by said processor, causes said processor to execute a process for accessing a virtual table, said process comprising:
identifying a data source;
associating a record within said data source to a virtual table, said virtual table having a different column signature than said record;
accessing said record; and

logically populating said virtual table with said record.